



***Quis Custodiet Ipsos Custodes***  
(Who Watches the Watchers?)

# P. A. C. T.

(**People Against Corruption & Tyranny**)

c/o: P.O. Box 1276, Linden, New Jersey; **NEAR POSTAL ZONE 07036**

## **DISCLAIMER**

The articles herein are for information purposes only. We do not practice law. We are not lawyers. Nothing in this newsletter is to be considered 'Legal Advice'. In any event, prudence demands you, the reader, conduct your own research before using any of the enclosed information in your own case.

YOU ARE WELCOME to reprint any suitable article herein. Please state "**REPRINTED FROM P. A. C. T.**" under that article; and state its publication date, for research purposes.

**1999 Volume - July Edition**

## **ADVICE FOR POTENTIAL LAWYERS VICTIMS**

by Martin Rodetsky

My son has just completed his rights of passage into the ungodly domain of lawyerdom. I have just received notice that he has been admitted to the New Jersey Bar and is also licensed to practice in New York. This brings to mind the times he 'made his bones' by helping, aiding and abetting his mother to destroy his own family; so just think what he is capable of doing to strangers. Spurred by those memories, I am compelled to freely give, herein, advice to the potential victims - excuse me, 'clients' - of all lawyers:

1. First of all, do NOT take any lawyer's word for ANYTHING! Remember that he has been inducted into the greatest band of thieves in history.
2. GET IT IN WRITING! Judges will always take the word of a brother rat over the innocent victims of his wrongdoing.
3. When any lawyer tells you that he "...canNOT guarantee anything", ask him WHY you should pay for his mistakes. Since lawyers make most of their money on Contingency Fees and/or Time Billing, have the retainer agreement made out in BOTH directions. If the lawyer loses, he is responsible for HALF the loss. If, as a result of his failure to defend you, the punishment includes jail time, he must agree to spend HALF the time (in jail) for you.
4. NEVER let the lawyers go into conferences with the judge. That is called 'deal making'; and what they are really doing is figuring out just how much money you have left, and what you will 'sit still' for when they carve it up to share with each other at your expense. Of course, you will NOT be able to watch what happens when you are not around...
5. BEFORE you go to court, DEMAND that your lawyer conduct ALL 'business' with the court in language you understand. Never forget that the Law Dictionaries are full of words you use every day; but there are MANY different meanings that you do NOT know. We have been in court listening to cases, where the judges and lawyers are holding conversations right in front of the litigants, but those 'SHEEPLE' have absolutely no idea of what the judge and the lawyers are talking about.
6. Even if the fee arrangement is contingency, you must still ORDER your lawyer to REFUSE to participate in 'pre-trial' hearings. First of all, the Constitution guarantees you ONE "...speedy trial"; NOT a series of 'mini-trials'. Since you would have to be mentally impaired to permit your lawyer to go to court without you, never forget that you are the only one there who is NOT getting paid (in one form or another). Every time your lawyer submits papers, you are paying for it; whether it be the mistakes he INTENTIONALLY made in the papers, or the PROOF he will submit

when you go before the 'FEE ARBITRATION COMMITTEE' when you lose the case and are still forced to pay for 'expenses'...

As a matter of fact:

6a. NEVER go to fee arbitration. First of all, you are VOLUNTEERING to permit your lawyer's brother rats to 'legitimize' the fees that should NEVER have been charged in the first place. Second, if the judge awards your lawyer 'attorney fees', DEMAND a TRIAL BY JURY; the very Right that you were denied when that creep was allegedly 'representing' you in the first place.

7. Whether or not you understand the law is irrelevant. You MUST be totally familiar with what is going on. After all, the outcome of this 'trial' may affect you for the rest of your life; and may endanger your family, your property, your liberty; your very life! As soon as you see something that you do NOT understand, STOP the proceedings and DEMAND that your lawyer explain EXACTLY what is going on. After all, if you don't understand what is going on, it can't possibly affect you. If your lawyer, or even the judge, say that it is "...too complicated for those not experienced in the law to understand"; what they are saying is that they are getting ready to SCREW YOU; and they don't want you to understand it. You might try to stop them; and they would lose all that money...

8. There are serious differences of opinion regarding jury trials; whether to have them, or not. P.A.C.T. has no such problem. We always demand jury trials. After all, we KNOW that the lawyers and judges intend to screw you. All that you have to do is to educate the jury; to inform them that the judges and lawyers intend to manipulate them into ruling against you. No matter how uninformed a juror may be, he - or she - will get downright ticked upon discovering that manipulation; and will blame the one attempting to commit the criminal act of "JURY TAMPERING".

9. BE PREPARED! The time to discover what you are going to do in the trial is NOT after that trial has started. Whether or not you have engaged a lawyer, plan not only what you intend to do, but also what you will do when the judge and lawyers place roadblocks in front of you. Obviously, you will NOT have the experience to do this on your own, so joining an organization like P.A.C.T. should be classified as a survival technique...

10. NEVER go to court alone. Ignoring the fact that judges regularly tamper with the transcripts, you will need witnesses to protect you from the ever-increasing acts of 'legal violence' being perpetrated by those you believe were entrusted with obligations to "...Protect and Serve". In previous articles, we have discussed cases like Briscoe v Lahue; where police are ENCOURAGED to lie under oath; and Deshaney v Winnebago; where police owe no duty to the public. Given the fact that judges routinely invoke immunity to protect them from the penalties of their



My 'son', I have tried to give you the results of my experiences over the past 10 years. You will, of course, make your own decisions. That is the responsibility you acquired when you became an adult. You can no longer claim that you are being manipulated by your mother; and you are smart enough to know when your brother rats are attempting cannibalism. If you are lucky, you will not only survive the anger of the clients you will screw as "S.O.P."; you may even survive the plotting and scheming of your fellow BAR'flies'.

## ADVICE TO MY SON, THE LAWYER

by Martin Rodetsky

Now, having given advice to help a lawyers potential victims - excuse me "clients" - survive their involvement within a litigation process, it is only fair that I remind my own son of the experience he brings to his chosen profession. Having completed the entire curriculum of theft, deception, fraud and subterfuge at one of the nation's finest law schools, he has been impeccably positioned to continue the SPLENDID works he started by stealing from his own grandmother.

My 'son' really has a lot to be thankful for. His mother taught him to lie, cheat and steal with all the grace and finesse usually found in judges, lawyers and other thieves having much more experience; all of the traits you would come to expect from someone as skilled and malevolent as my ex-wife. I used to brag that was the reason that I married her. I can now honestly say that I made a B-I-I-I-I-G mistake.

The only mistake that both my ex-wife and my 'son' made, however, was not only to get caught stealing from my mother, but also to go into court and confess to their wrongdoing's. Not only did Esther confess to stealing, but my 'son' also confessed that he still had some of the ill gotten gains. Even though the judge, Maurice Gallipoli, awarded my mother less than 10 cents on the dollar against the total theft, my 'son' and his mother only produced about half of what they were ordered to produce by the court. What was expected is that neither the court, the sheriff nor the police; were interested in helping my mother to regain the property that was stolen from her. I guess that contempt of court only applies to honest people; since judges, lawyers and other thieves are considered immune by the criminal justice system (also known as the law enforcement growth industry).

My 'son', since you are now entering the official career of getting paid for lying, cheating and stealing; there are some observations that I can make to help you; observations gained by carefully watching lawyers, judges, sheriff's deputies and police officers knowingly, willfully, intelligently and intentionally breaking the laws they took oaths to uphold and protect.

1. Do not trust your mother. You must never forget that she trained you to betray your own family and to steal from your own grandmother. What makes you think that she wouldn't sell you out as well?

2. Do not trust your 'brother rats'. There are documented cases of rats practicing Cannibalism. After all, the rules of professional conduct (RPC) and the canons of judicial conduct clearly discourage wrongdoings and require the observer to report these heinous acts to the proper authorities. The only question is: When did you last see a judge or lawyer report his colleagues? I actually heard this from a lawyer considered honest and honourable by his peers:

"If you've a friend who's tried and true, SCREW him BEFORE he can screw you".

3. Never confess to anything. Frankly, I was surprised not only by your admission, but by your mother's confession. What didn't surprise me was that Gallipoli IGNORED your confession; and did NOTHING to return the rest of the stolen property. I have often wondered what it took to "...encourage" him to commit a blatant act of Misprision of Felony. It would sure be interesting to inspect his 'hidden bank accounts'...

4. Always blame others. Whenever you do wrong, whether intentionally or by accident, there's always an innocent bystander who will not be

prepared to deal with an accusation made by a lawyer to be evaluated by a brother rat in a black dress.

5. Litigate, litigate, litigate. Never forget that barratry is profitable. Always remember to fight for your client's rights to access courts as long as there is sufficient money (or convert-able assets) left to pay your fees. Since your mother trained you that money is more important than family, you should be well-prepared to deal with your fiancée; especially after you get married. I do, however, wish to provide your fiancée with an observation I have learned since becoming a P.A.C.T. member:

"When you lie down with dogs, you wake up with fleas. When you lie down with cobras, you do NOT wake up at all..."

6. Forget your oath to uphold and defend the law to protect your client. Always remember the attorney/client oath has delineated in C.J.S.:

FIRST loyalty is to the Court.

SECOND loyalty is to the State.

THIRD loyalty is to public policy.

The Client comes FOURTH!

7. You were so successful stealing from your own family and betraying those who loved you that you were welcomed with open arms into the 'Bar'. If you continue to be successful at betraying your clients, violating your fiduciary responsibilities and harming those you committed to protect; they will probably make you a judge. Then, you'll be in the position of succumbing to your own fantasies and aberrations; and raping the public with impunity. Or, is that word "immunity"...

## THE SHAPE OF THINGS TO COME

by Jon Roland

Ed. Note: We have been hearing about these new 'sentencing guidelines' for a while now, but have NOT been able to formulate an effective campaign to counteract it. What should be obvious is that the groundrules MUST be determined BEFORE you permit yourself to be tried, and that you MUST be able to 'educate' the jury as to the powers that have been STOLEN from them; powers that were USURPED, and given to a judge who has already demonstrated bias and prejudice before the case even started. What is your opinion? Send them c/o pact@juno.com.

You can be held accountable for murder WITHOUT A JURY TRIAL

The Sixth Amendment to the US Constitution provides for the right of jury trial "in all criminal prosecutions."

In the past, this has always meant that the jury decides not only that you are guilty of a crime, but how serious a crime you are guilty of. For example, if you are charged with armed robbery, the jury decides whether you are guilty of armed robbery, unarmed robbery, simple larceny (theft), or nothing at all. Similarly, if you are charged with murder, the jury decides whether you are guilty of first degree murder, second degree murder, manslaughter, or nothing at all. At least, that is the traditional approach.

### WHY THE GOVERNMENT DISLIKES JURY TRIALS

Government finds the right to jury trial to be the most chafing, irritating thing that confronts them. After all, why should Government employees have to seek the approval of 12 citizens before they take action they think should be taken? Not only do jurors slow things down, but there is always the chance they will not vote the way the Government wants.

Another problem with the jury trial, as the Government sees it, is that with a jury trial you have to call witnesses, and subject them to cross-examination. They would prefer to simply give a report to the judge on the results of their "investigation," rather than have to call witnesses. Witnesses are highly inconvenient for a number of reasons. First, Government officials often have to bribe them with reduced charges. Second, many witnesses, being not as bright as lawyers, might not remember all the details of their stories the way the Government agents have



ond, many witnesses, being not as bright as lawyers, might not remember all the details of their stories the way the Government agents have told it to them. Third, some witnesses might change their mind in a courtroom. Fourth, witnesses subjected to cross-examination by the other side might unwittingly reveal that some of their testimony is false.

#### THE US SENTENCING GUIDELINES--MORE THAN JUST NUMBERS

If you are charged with murder, you have the right to a jury trial for murder. So, to avoid that, they try you for drugs, or conspiracy to be involved with drugs. Once you are convicted of drugs or drug conspiracy, the Government can issue a report to the judge blaming you for murder. Based on that report, the judge can find you "responsible" for murder, and sentence you for murder, even though you have never been charged with murder, tried for murder, or found guilty of murder. And, you do not have the right to question your accusers.

This result comes about by way of the US Sentencing Guidelines. A federal statute, 28 USC 994, provided for a committee to decide on matters of sentencing. Their decisions are the US Sentencing Guidelines.

Under the Guidelines, a person's Offense Level determines their range of sentences, and a person's Offense Level depends on facts. Of critical importance to this scheme is that a judge decides the facts concerning the Guidelines. A jury is not involved at all.

Under Guideline 2D1.1, a person being sentenced for drugs or drug conspiracy can be found responsible for murder by the judge, and receive the same sentence as would be applied for murder. This is true even if, at the trial for drugs, the subject of murder was never even mentioned.

In fact, numerous cases hold that if you are convicted of any federal crime, you can be sentenced for conduct of which the jury found you not guilty, if the judge thinks you really did it. See, among other cases, *United States v. Mocchiola*, 891 F.2d 13 (1st Cir. 1989); *United States v. Patino*, 962 F.2d 263 (2d Cir. 1992); *United States v. Blankenship*, 954 F.2d 1224 (6th Cir. 1992).

*United States v. Watts*: Level of justice at Supreme Court hits new low. The US Supreme Court, by a 7 to 2 vote, recently upheld this "principle" in the case of *United States v. Watts*, decided January 6, 1997. The jury found Vernon Watts guilty of selling drugs, but not guilty of possessing a weapon. The judge sentenced him for drug dealing and "enhanced" his sentence for his "relevant conduct" of possessing a weapon. In the same case, the Supreme Court sealed the fate of Cheryl Putra. The jury found her guilty of one drug transaction, and not guilty of a second. The judge sentenced her for the first drug transaction and "enhanced" her sentence for her "relevant conduct" of committing the second. In both cases, the Supreme Court thought that was just fine.

The Supreme Court stated:

"In short, we are convinced that a sentencing court may consider conduct of which a defendant has been acquitted."

Justice John Paul Stevens, in dissent, said:

"It is difficult to square this explicit statutory command to impose incremental punishment for each of the 'multiple offenses' of which a defendant 'is convicted' with the conclusion that Congress intended incremental punishment for each offense of which the defendant has been acquitted. The Court, however, appears willing to read the statute's treatment of multiple offenses as though it authorized an incremental penalty for each offense for which the defendant was indicted if she is convicted of at least one such offense. The fact that the text of the statute expressly authorizes such incremental punishment 'for each offense' only when a 'defendant is convicted of . . . multiple offenses' conveys a far different message to thoughtful judges..."

The notion that a charge that cannot be sustained by proof beyond a reasonable doubt may give rise to the same punishment as if it had been so proved is repugnant to that jurisprudence."

Justice Anthony Kennedy also dissented, commenting:

"At several points the per curiam opinion shows hesitation in confronting the distinction between uncharged conduct and conduct related to a charge for which the defendant was acquitted. The distinction ought to be confronted by a reasoned course of argument, not by shrugging it off.

At the least it ought to be said that to increase a sentence based on conduct underlying a charge for which the defendant was acquitted does raise concerns about undercutting the verdict of acquittal, concerns noted by Justice Stevens and the other federal judges to whom he refers in his dissent."

So, the rule is simple. You can't win, even when you win. Even a not guilty verdict from a jury cannot prevent the government from saying you did it, and punishing you accordingly.

It is somewhat comforting that 2 justices were willing to vote for justice in this case, even though 7 were not. It is also disappointing and instructive that of the two Supreme Court justices appointed by a Democratic president, Breyer and Ginsburg, neither was among the two justice minority that voted for justice.

#### WORDS GET NEW MEANING AT SUPREME COURT

When people are elevated to the Supreme Court, it often causes them, and consequently all courts, to use words in new, imaginative ways. For example, a member of the Supreme Court, rather than being called a "judge," is called a "justice," regardless of whether his or her rulings are just.

The judicial principle that words do not mean what they say, especially when what the words say conflicts with the desire of government officials to exercise power, is illustrated by many cases. See, for example, cases dealing with the fact that the Sixth Amendment provides that the accused is entitled to trial by an impartial jury "in all criminal prosecutions." In *Lewis v. United States* (1996) the Supreme Court said that a person could be prosecuted for misdemeanors carrying 6 months in prison, without a jury trial. They also said that a person could be charged with multiple misdemeanors, tried for all without a jury, and sentenced to decades of imprisonment from multiple consecutive 6 month terms. So, by reading the rulings of the Supreme Court, you learn that "all criminal prosecutions" really means "some criminal prosecutions", and you have no right to a jury to protect you from the government if you are charged with a "petty" offense. I wonder how petty they would think it was if they had to spend the six months or 10 years in prison.

It is true that in England before the American Revolution, there was no right to jury trial for "petty" offenses. Perhaps the justices simply forgot who won the Revolution. Perhaps they forgot that the Bill of Rights was designed to change the British way of governing, not to perpetuate it. The Revolutionaries who granted sweeping rights to the American people did so in reaction to the practices of the entrenched judicial establishment of the time. Today's entrenched judicial establishment can void those rights, and regain the power their fellow judges lost in 1787, simply by declaring that words mean something other than what they say.

If the authors of the Bill of Rights really did want to limit the right of jury trial to those criminal prosecutions carrying a penalty greater than 6 months, don't you think they would have said so? Courts don't. Words just do not mean the same thing in a courtroom as they do in ordinary speech.

So what can they say in response? That if the founding fathers had meant "all," they would have said so? They did say so.

Are there other examples? Of course there are. The Eleventh Amendment to the Constitution states: "The Judicial power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity, commenced or prosecuted against one of the United States by Citizens of another State, or by Citizens or Subjects of any Foreign State." The Supreme Court ruled that "Citizens of another State" means not only citizens of another state, but citizens of the same state. See *Welch v. Texas Highways & Public Transportation Department*, 483 U.S. 468 (1987).



judges throw people into prison for peaceably keeping and bearing arms, with the full approval of the Supreme Court.

Therefore, can it really be so surprising that the Supreme Court in *United States v. Watts* would rule that a jury verdict of "not guilty" does not prevent a judge from saying you really are guilty, and sentencing you accordingly?

#### HOW THE GUIDELINES APPLY TO REAL-LIFE SITUATIONS

Let's take the example of Mr. A. Mr. A was selling drugs on a street corner. He was provided the drugs by Mr. B, who got them from Mr. C. Normally, the sentence of Mr. A would depend on how much drugs he sold. For example, if he sold 5 grams of crack cocaine (.011 pounds, or 1/90 of a pound), and had no criminal record, his sentence under the guidelines would be 63 to 78 months, or in the vicinity of 6 years.

The jury that convicts Mr. A thinks they are convicting him for drugs, and nothing more.

But let us say that Mr. D, a friend of Mr. C's, once killed someone unknown to Mr. A. Let us further say that Mr. A has never met Mr. D, or indeed, ever met Mr. C. Under the law, the judge, sitting without a jury, and basing his decision on "reports" issued by the Government, could find that Mr. A conspired not only with Mr. B, but with Mr. C and Mr. D as well. The judge could therefore find Mr. A responsible for any crime committed by Mr. D, including murder. Mr. A's sentence would then be 40 years in prison.

I should point out that the courts have repeatedly ruled that a person can be found guilty or responsible for conspiracy with people he does not know, has never met, and has never even heard of.

The jury is not permitted to know what punishment would be imposed for the drug involvement. The jury is not permitted to decide the amount of drugs for which Mr. A is responsible. The jury is not told that a person could get 6 years for an amount of drugs smaller than your pinky finger. The jury is not told that the actual sentence could be up to 40 years, because their drug verdict could allow the judge to hold the defendant responsible for murder.

The decision on whether Mr. A should be held accountable for a murder of someone he never met, committed by someone he never met, is an important one, making the difference between 6 years in prison and 40 years in prison. You would think that such a major decision would fall within the Sixth Amendment right to jury trial. You would be wrong. The judge, all by himself, decides the matter, without a single witness ever being called or questioned. The hapless Mr. A gets a jury trial on drugs, but none on murder. If Mr. A had two ounces of crack, the murder would get him sentenced to prison for life, again without a jury trial on whether he was involved in murder.

This way of doing things is working so well for prosecutors that we can predict more and more things being taken out of the hands of jurors and placed in the hands of judges.

#### WHAT THE FUTURE HOLDS

Here's an example. In the future, there will be a crime known as "stealing." If convicted, you can be sentenced anywhere from probation to life in prison. If the judge finds that the amount was large, or that violence was used, or that drugs were involved, he would impose life, but if he did not find those things, the penalty would be less. Jurors would never decide whether there was just a theft (larceny), or a theft by force (robbery), or a forceful theft while armed (armed robbery). Those distinctions could now be in the hands of a judge.

Here's another example. In the future, there will be a crime known as "violence." If convicted, you can be sentenced anywhere from probation to life in prison or death. If the judge finds that someone died from the violence, he could impose death. If he found that a gun was used, or that the purpose was rape, he could impose life, but if he did not find those things, the penalty would be less. Jurors would never decide whether

there was just an ordinary assault and battery, or a rape, or a murder. Those distinctions could now be in the hands of a judge.

The underlying theory behind all this is that jurors simply do not follow the Government line closely enough to be trusted with major decisions. The Government now has a potent tool in its hands that allows it to avoid unpredictable things like witnesses, cross-examination and juries, and base everything strictly on Government allegation.

The shocking thing is that your Supreme Court, which is supposed to uphold the Constitution, lets this go on. Whether they are appointed by Republicans like Reagan, or Democrats like Clinton, they all seem to think that juries are a big waste of time. Think of all the people a judge could sentence to prison in the time a lawyer would spend cross-examining a witness! This big time-waster is now being done away with. The Supreme Court believes that liberty is a small price to pay for more efficient allocation of court resources. Do you?

## THE REST OF THE STORY

Contributed by John Gunderson

(Paul Harvey read this recently on his radio show)

For the life of me, I can't understand what could have gone wrong in Littleton, Colo. If only the parents had kept their children away from the guns, we wouldn't have had such a tragedy. Yeah, it must have been the guns.

It couldn't have been because of half our children being raised in broken homes.

It couldn't have been because our children get to spend an average of 30 seconds in meaningful conversation with their parents each day. After all, we give our children quality time.

It couldn't have been because we treat our children as pets and our pets as children. It couldn't have been because we place our children in day care centers where they learn their socialization skills among their peers under the law of the jungle while employees who have no vested interest in the children look on and make sure that no blood is spilled.

It couldn't have been because we allow our children to watch, on average, seven hours of television a day filled with the glorification of sex and violence that isn't fit for adult consumption.

It couldn't have been because we allow our children to enter into virtual worlds in which, to win the game, one must kill as many opponents as possible in the most sadistic way possible.

It couldn't have been because we have sterilized and contracepted our families down to sizes so small that the children we do have are so spoiled with material things that they come to equate the receiving of the material with love.

It couldn't have been because our children, who historically have been seen as a blessing from God, are now being viewed as either a mistake created when contraception fails or conveniences that parents try to raise in their spare time.

It couldn't have been because our nation is the world leader in developing a culture of death in which 20 million to 30 million babies have been killed by abortion. It couldn't have been because we give two-year prison sentences to teen-agers who kill their newborns.

Ed. Note: There have been 2 stories recently broadcast on the local news programs. In the first one, the father is accused of strangling his son; an obviously heinous crime. They are seeking the death penalty. In the second case, the mother was charged with killing 8 of her 10 children. While the effects are the same, she was convicted; and will spend 20 years ON PROBATION! While there is no information as to how much time she spent in jail BEFORE trial, there is no doubt of the lunacy concerning the imposition of punishment.

It couldn't have been because our school systems teach the children that they are nothing but glorified apes who have evolutionized out of some



primordial soup of mud by teaching evolution as fact and by handing out condoms as if they were candy.

It couldn't have been because we teach our children that there are no laws of morality that transcend us, that everything is relative and that actions don't have consequences. What the heck, the president gets away with it.

Nah, it must have been the guns.

## OFFICIAL BUSINESS

Jay Rutledge

I had read the phrase OFFICIAL BUSINESS many times without understanding, but then one time when I read it, a saying came to me. It was the words of Calvin Coolidge that, "The business of America is business."

OFFICIAL BUSINESS combines and encapsulates for me the two threads of research of patriots. BUSINESS connects to the research threads on the Uniform Commercial Code and Jurisdiction (Admiralty, Maritime, and Common Law). OFFICIAL connects to the research thread on war and emergency power and law martial rule. Together they describe an interdependent federal-state government that enforces for agencies of itself quasi commercial instruments and statutes on artificial persons and corporations in legislative tribunals in a regional venue having regulated judicial power on the pretext of regulating interstate commerce and protecting national security.

You may recognize the phrase OFFICIAL BUSINESS as taken from an envelope mailed by Internal Revenue Service.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA is an agency of the United States (or is it UNITED STATES?). COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA is an agency of Virginia. Likewise the Virginia Company was an agency of the King of England. It is all very neatly tied together. Cars and land are titled by these agencies.

The employer is the COLLECTING AGENT of FICA.

The employer is the WITHHOLDING AGENT of wages.

The Federal Reserve System is the FISCAL AGENT of the U.S. Treasury.

Is your ARTIFICIAL PERSON an agency of you???

My heartfelt thanks to all the sons of liberty who have researched so diligently and so long.

And my deepest gratitude, respect, and admiration for those heroes among us who have risked and paid for this knowledge with their treasure, blood, lives, and liberty.

## HIDDEN THREATS - PART I

Geoff Metcalf  
WorldNetDaily.com

For several years now I have been getting all sorts of wild reports about "Government Internment Camps." I have generally dismissed these rumblings as classic right-wing paranoia, extrapolation of facts not yet in evidence, or creative writing. However, recently, additional information has been revealed which lends credibility to the myriad concerns which have been expressed. Hey, even paranoids get chased.

The U.S. Army director of resource management has confirmed the validity of a memorandum relating to the establishment of a civilian inmate labor program under development by the Department of Army. The document states, "Enclosed for your review and comment is the draft Army regulation on civilian inmate labor utilization" and the procedure to "establish civilian prison camps on installations."

Civilian internment camps or prison camps, often referred to as concentration camps, have been the subject of much rumor and speculation during the past several years in this country. Various publications, Internet threads and some radio talk programs have focused on the issue.

However, I found it significant when Rep. Henry Gonzalez, D-TX, clarified the question of the existence of these civilian detention camps. In an interview Hank said, "the truth is yes -- you do have these standby provisions, and the plans are here ... whereby you could, in the name of stopping terrorism ... evoke the military and arrest Americans and put them in detention camps." Heck, we did it before (to Americans of Japanese descent), we could do it again.

This is not anything new. This is not a partisan Democrat/Republican, or Conservative/Liberal issue. It may have just recently been actually acknowledged, but it has a history.

Most even modestly educated folks know that Hitler did it, and Stalin did it. However, you should know that the venerable Franklin Delano Roosevelt also developed a plan for the United States. In fact, on Aug. 24, 1939, ole FDR met with FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover to develop the detention plan for us. Five months later, Hitler opened the Auschwitz detention center in Poland.

Hoover met with Attorney General J. Howard McGrath on Aug. 3, 1948 to detail a plan whereby President Truman could suspend constitutional liberties during a national emergency. The plan was code-named "Security Portfolio" and, when implemented, it would authorize the FBI to summarily arrest up to 20,000 persons and place them in national security detention camps. Prisoners would not have the right to a court hearing or habeas corpus appeal. "Security Portfolio" allowed the FBI to develop a watch list of those who would be detained as well as detailed information on their physical appearance, family, place of work, etc. This was long before sub-dermal bio-chip implants, retinal scans and other biometrics.

Two years later, Congress approved the Internal Security Act of 1950. This pre-FEMA puppy contained a provision authorizing an emergency detention plan. It is real interesting that Hoover was not satisfied with this law because it did not suspend the Constitution and it guaranteed the right to a court hearing (habeas corpus). For two years, while the FBI continued to secretly establish the detention camps and work out detailed seizure plans for thousands of individuals, Hoover kept badgering Attorney General McGrath for the official permission to ignore the 1950 law and move on with the more aggressive 1948 program.

As evidence that we have waaaaay too many laws, codes, rules and regulations, **IT WASN'T UNTIL THE SENATE HELD HEARINGS IN DECEMBER OF 1975 (25 YEARS LATER) THAT IT WAS REVEALED THE ONGOING INTERNMENT PLAN HAD NEVER BEEN TERMINATED.** The report, entitled, "Intelligence Activities, Senate Resolution 21," exposed the covert agenda. In a series of documents, memos and testimony by assorted government informants, the reality emerged of the designs by the federal government (our government) to monitor, infiltrate, arrest and incarcerate a potentially large segment of American society. That Senate report also exposed the existence of the Master Search Warrant (MSW) and the Master Arrest Warrant (MAW) which, by the way, are currently STILL in force today.

The MAW document, authorized by the attorney general of the United States, directs the head of the FBI to: "Arrest persons whom I deem dangerous to the public peace and safety. These persons are to be detained and confined until further order." Please note the language, "Whom I deem dangerous." Who might a Janet Reno choose to arbitrarily and capriciously "deem dangerous"? Constitutional Conservatives? Patriots? Conservative Republicans? Radio Talk Show Hosts? Joe Farah and everyone on the administration's enemies list?

The MSW also instructs the FBI director to "search certain premises where (1) it is believed that there may be found contraband, prohibited articles, or (2) other materials in violation of the Proclamation of the President of the United States. It includes (3) such items as firearms, shortwave radio receiving sets, cameras, propaganda materials, printing presses, mimeography machines, membership and financial records of organizations or groups (4) that have been declared subversive, or may hereafter be declared subversive by the Attorney General."



I added the numbers for ease of the following:

1. "it is BELIEVED that there MAY be" -- Hell-o?!?!? No probable cause needed. Just Because. Because they can by brute force.
2. "other materials in violation of the Proclamation of the President of the United States" -- Huh? Procla-freaking-mation?!?!?
3. "such items as firearms ..." -- The EXACT reason we have the Second Amendment is to preclude this kind of neutering. The framers WANTED us armed to prevent abuse of power under the color of authority.  
"shortwave radio receiving sets" -- Silence the critics, and deny INFORMATION to the people.  
"cameras" -- To prevent the dissemination of abuses of power?  
"propaganda materials" -- Like Thomas Paines' "Common Sense" or a contemporary WorldNetDaily.  
"mimeography machines" -- Expect that to turn into fax machines, computers and modems.
4. "that have been declared subversive, or MAY hereafter be declared subversive by the Attorney General." -- In other words, "facts which contradict the administration's preconceived opinions" or anything which does not conform with the politically correct government sanctioned view.

## THE COPS ARE OUT OF CONTROL

From WorldNetDaily

Until very recently, as a law-abiding person, the presence of police generally gave me a feeling of security, well-being, order.

Not any more. I confess that, lately, when I see a cop in my rear-view mirror, I get a very uneasy feeling.

Maybe it's the horror stories we're hearing. Maybe it's the way local and state police have become little more than appendages of the federal law-enforcement apparatus. Maybe it's the fact that so many cops have taken sides against the Constitution and the rights of the people in the name of more efficient crime-prevention.

But the recent incidents in Oklahoma, where police shot an unarmed mother holding her child in her home, in Virginia, where a SWAT team killed a watchman guarding a dice game at an after-hours club and in California, where a Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms raid on a gun shop resulted in the death of the shopkeeper, provide some hard evidence that police in America may be getting out of control.

I think also about columnist Geoff Metcalf's anecdote about the law-abiding man arrested and jailed for having in his possession a tire iron, which was classified as a deadly weapon. Had he brandished it? No. Had he threatened anyone? No. Had the California Highway Patrol officer awakened on the wrong side of her bed that morning? Maybe.

But when you start putting all these incidents together, with the back-drop of the massacre in Waco, Texas, and the unnecessary shootout at Ruby Ridge, it's no wonder Americans like me are beginning to worry about the possibilities of an emerging police state.

"Oh, it couldn't happen here," some retort. "America is different. The cops are our friends."

That may have been true through most of our history. But there's one big difference today. The government no longer trusts the people. There is a move to disarm the populace and to entrust our safety solely to professional law enforcement. This is a pattern we've seen in other authoritarian and totalitarian regimes. It's a prerequisite to the formation of a police state. It's what our Founding Fathers warned us about. It's why we have a Second Amendment.

One of the other problems we face in America today is the increasing number of laws on the books designed to turn virtually everyone into a law-breaker.

It's easier for cops today to fill their quota of arrests and citations by targeting non-threatening, non-violent citizens than it is actually chasing

down violent criminals. Too often, today's cops make no distinction between hardened, professional criminals, and people who may or may not be in technical violation of the law -- perhaps even an unjust, unconstitutional law.

But the biggest danger we face is the federalization and militarization of all law enforcement. Inter-agency task forces, bringing together local and state police with federal agents are now the rule of the day. Federal agencies bribe local cops with funding, equipment and training programs.

America is rapidly becoming an "us vs. them" society -- with the cops and government on one side and the people on the other. Many of us don't feel the heat yet. But it's just a matter of time before we're all confronted with the harsh realities of the new emerging police state.

One of these days -- and it may be sooner rather than later -- America is going to be confronted with a real domestic emergency. It's not a matter of if, but when. We've had precious few real domestic crises throughout our history, and Americans have become spoiled. Thus, we take our freedoms for granted.

There are so many possibilities and excuses on the horizon -- Y2K, terrorism, the threat posed by weapons of mass destruction from rogue states as well as China and Russia.

Will America respond to the next crisis in a way that preserves our civil rights and liberties? Or will we lose our tentative grasp on freedom -- giving up an illustrious tradition for the sake of security, safety, order?

If we're to maintain any semblance of freedom in the worst of times, we must hold the government and police accountable in the best of times.

Ed. Note: This article did NOT take into consideration the facts surrounding the Abner Louima or Diallo cases.

## WE ARE PICKING THE WRONG TARGETS!

Contributed by Heidi Gerstad

### NEWS FROM THE LIBERTARIAN PARTY

Why no government murderers, robbers, or perverts on the FBI's 10 Most Wanted list?

WASHINGTON, DC -- The most shocking thing about the FBI's new "10 Most Wanted" list is all the dangerous criminals who are not on it:

The criminals who just happen to work for the federal government, the Libertarian Party said today.

"From murder to kidnapping to sexual assault -- many government employees have committed what would be considered heinous crimes if perpetrated by ordinary citizens," said Steve Dasbach, the party's national director. "But curiously, none of those government desperados made it onto the FBI's list."

On Monday, the FBI released the latest edition of its famous 10 Most Wanted list, which included a frightful line-up of murderers, international terrorists, robbers, and bombers.

And that's good, said Dasbach: "Every person on that list who committed a crime of violence should be punished; justice demands it. But justice also demands that everyone who commits a crime of violence be treated equally -- even if they happen to be a politician, the head of a federal agency, or a government bureaucrat."

With that in mind, Dasbach offered a Libertarian version of the FBI's 10 Most Wanted list: Government criminals who weren't on the list, but should be.

1. U.S. Customs Commissioner Raymond Kelly. Crime: Accessory to sexual assault. "Last year, U.S. Customs employees under Kelly's command ordered 2,797 international airline passengers to strip off their clothes at gunpoint, intimately groped them, and conducted humiliating body cavity searches," said Dasbach. "Ordinary Americans who behave this way are called sex criminals, but Customs inspectors who behave like perverts are given promotions."



2. Justice Dept Asset Forfeiture Division Chief Jerry McDowell. Crime: Grand larceny. "Last year, the Justice Dept confiscated 42,454 cars, boats, houses, and other belongings — valued at over \$604 million — from Americans who were never convicted of any crime," said Dasbach. "That's theft on a mind-boggling scale, and makes Jerry McDowell one of the criminal masterminds of the century."

3. Marine Corporal Clemente Banuelos. Crime: Murder. "In 1997, Banuelos and three fellow Marines on an anti-drug patrol in Redford, Texas, gunned down 18-year-old Ezequiel Hernandez as he was herding goats near the Mexican border," noted Dasbach. "Why is cold-blooded murder not considered murder when committed by someone wearing a Marine Corps insignia?"

4. President Bill Clinton. Crime: International terrorism. "Osama bin Laden made the FBI's list for killing 224 people in embassy bombings — yet Clinton has killed literally thousands of innocent civilians during his undeclared and unconstitutional war in Yugoslavia," said Dasbach. "That kind of mass murder of innocents should not go unpunished by a civilized nation."

5. Former NHTSA director Joan Claybrook. Crime: Accessory to murder. "As head of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration in the 1970s, Claybrook forced automakers to install air bags, many of which have malfunctioned and exploded, killing 115 people," said Dasbach. "If Death-by-Regulation isn't a crime, it should be — and Claybrook should be the first person prosecuted."

6. Social Security Commissioner Kenneth S. Apfel. Crime: Investment fraud. "If an ordinary American did what Apfel and his Social Security co-conspirators do — run a retirement program where the only assets are billions of dollars of IOUs — they would be in jail faster than you can yell 'AARP!'" said Dasbach. "Why is the government's Ponzi Scheme, where new investors are paid with money from old investors, not shut down like any other criminal pyramid scheme would be?"

7. Attorney General Janet Reno. Crime: Conspiracy to commit murder. "Not even the Mafia would do what Janet Reno ordered done on April 19, 1993: Assault a religious compound with tanks, military helicopters, and poison gas," said Dasbach. "Yet that's what happened in Waco, Texas — killing 69 men, women, and children. Son of Sam is in jail for committing serial murder: Why isn't Janet Reno?"

8. FBI sniper Lon Horiuchi. Crime: Murder. "In 1992, Horiuchi used a high-powered rifle to assassinate Vicki Weaver in Ruby Ridge, Idaho, as she stood in her kitchen holding her 11-month-old infant daughter," said Dasbach. "You may not like the political views of her husband, white separatist Randy Weaver, but that shouldn't have given government employees the right to declare open season on his family."

9. Drug czar Barry McCaffrey. Crime: Kidnapping, false imprisonment. "Under McCaffrey's direction, 695,200 people were arrested in 1997 for marijuana offenses, 87% of whom were accused of mere possession," noted Dasbach. "For this victimless crime, these people were arrested at gunpoint, dumped into jail cells, and deprived of their liberty — while millions of violent criminals were allowed to run free. That's the real crime."

10. U.S. Rep. Bill McCollum (R-FL). Crime: Illegal telephone tapping. "Last year, McCollum inserted a roving wiretap provision into the Intelligence Authorization Act of 1998 — giving federal agents the power to eavesdrop on anyone's phone calls without a court order," said Dasbach. "Unauthorized eavesdropping is a crime: Let's prosecute Rep. McCollum for it."

So, do Libertarians think any of these government "criminals" will ever end up behind bars?

"Perhaps not," admitted Dasbach. "But it's nice to dream about an America where equal justice under the law is a reality. And if nothing else, it would be nice if some of these most wanted criminals became some of America's least wanted politicians."

...

## NOT THE PERFECT CRIME

blame: Jim Hallas

Tired of constantly being broke, and stuck in an unhappy marriage, a young husband decided to solve both problems by taking out a large insurance policy on his wife (with himself as the beneficiary), and arranging to have her killed.

A "friend of a friend" put him in touch with a nefarious underworld figure named "Artie." Artie explained to the husband that his going price for snuffing out a spouse was \$5,000.

The husband said OK, but that he wouldn't have any cash on hand until he could collect his wife's insurance money.

Artie insisted on being paid SOMETHING up front. The man opened up his wallet, displaying the single dollar bill that rested inside. Artie sighed, rolled his eyes, and reluctantly agreed to accept the dollar as down payment for the dirty deed.

A few days later, Artie followed the man's wife to the local Safeway grocery store. There, he surprised her in the produce department, and proceeded to strangle her with his gloved hands.

As the poor unsuspecting woman drew her last breath, and slumped to the floor, the manager of the produce department stumbled onto the scene. Unwilling to leave any witnesses behind, Artie had no choice but to strangle the produce manager as well.

Unknown to Artie, the entire proceedings were captured by hidden cameras and observed by the store's security guard, who immediately called the police. Artie was caught and arrested before he could leave the store.

Under intense questioning at the police station, Artie revealed the sordid plan, including his financial arrangements with the hapless husband.

### DRUM ROLL

And that is why, the next day in the newspaper, the headline declared:

[You're going to hate me for this]:

**"ARTIE CHOKES TWO FOR A DOLLAR AT SAFEWAY."**

## SPEAKING OF SLICK WILLIE...

Contributed by Dan Meador

Chrysler Corporation is adding a new car to its line to honor Bill Clinton. The Dodge Draft will begin production in Canada this year.

When Clinton was asked what he thought about foreign affairs, he replied, I don't know. I never had one.

If you came across Bill Clinton struggling in a raging river and you had a choice between rescuing him or getting a Pulitzer prize-winning photograph, what shutter speed would you use?

Chelsea asked her dad, "Do all fairy tales begin with once upon a time...?" Bill Clinton replied, "No. Some begin with 'After I'm elected...'"

Clinton's mother prayed fervently that Bill would grow up and be president. So far, half of her prayer has been answered.

American Indians have nicknamed Bill Clinton as "Walking Eagle" because he is so full of crap that he can't fly.

Isn't putting Bill Clinton in charge of a trust fund (SS) as insane as putting in a draft-dodger as Commander-in-Chief?

Clinton only lacks three things to become one of America's finest leaders: Integrity, vision, and wisdom.

Clinton is doing the work of three men: Larry, Curly, and Moe.



# P. A. C. T. (People Against Corruption & Tyranny)

## APPLICATION FOR MEMBERSHIP

NAME: \_\_\_\_\_ PHONE: \_\_\_\_\_  
ADDRESS: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ ☐ SINGLE ☐ MARRIED ☐ DIVORCED ☐ OTHER

**HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT P.A.C.T.?** \_\_\_\_\_

**WHAT KIND OF LITIGATION ARE YOU INVOLVED WITH?** \_\_\_\_\_

☐ FAMILY ☐ DOMESTIC VIOLENCE ☐ DIVORCE ☐ CUSTODY ☐ VISITATION ☐ MOTOR VEHICLE  
☐ TAXES ☐ CIVIL RIGHTS ☐ OTHER \_\_\_\_\_

COURTS \_\_\_\_\_ JUDGES \_\_\_\_\_  
(State, County, Municipal, Federal, Appeal) for each judge, attach evaluation (optional)

**CAN YOU BE OF ASSISTANCE TO P.A.C.T.?** (check ALL that apply) \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Court Watch ☐ Research ☐ Fund Raising ☐ Legislative ☐ Public Relations  
☐ Protest/Demonstration ☐ Newsletter ☐ Hospitality ☐ Typing ☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_

**P.A.C.T. CAN HELP YOU HELP YOURSELF:**

**CLINIC: \$5 fee; 2nd THURSDAY OF EACH MONTH, 7:30 PM at the American Legion Post #102,  
112 W. Elizabeth Ave., Linden, New Jersey**

**Newsletter Subscription (for non-members): \$36 per year**

**Membership: \$60.00 per year (includes newsletter)**

**Send mail to: P.A.C.T., c/o: POB 1276, Linden, New Jersey Near Postal Zone 07036**

## NON-DOMESTIC First Class Matter

Letter rate of 2 cents per half ounce established by Congressional Law (12 Stat. at Large, Sess. III, Ch. 71, Sec. 23). Any other rate constitutes a criminal violation of 18 USC 1726.

## NO POSTAGE DUE Reservation of All Rights

**Clinic Meeting Dates to come in 1999:**

(2nd Thursday of each month, at 7:30 PM)

July 8, August 12, September 9, October 14,

November 11, December 9